

**MINUTES OF THE
GREENSBORO BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
APRIL 27, 2009**

The regular meeting of the Greensboro Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, April 27, 2009 at 2:00 p.m. in the City Council Chamber of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. The following Board members were present: Chair John Cross, Russ Parmele, Clinton Turner, Rick Pinto, Scott Brewington, Bill Strickland and Brian Pearce. Staff present were Rawls Howard, Zoning Administrator, Chris Marland, Planning Services and Becky Jo Peterson-Buie, City Attorney's Office.

Chair Cross called the meeting to order and explained the policies and procedures of the Board of Adjustment. He further explained the manner in which the Board conducts its hearings and the method of appealing any ruling made by the Board. Vice Chair Cross also advised that each side, regardless of the number of speakers, would be allowed a total of 20 minutes to present evidence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Parmele moved to approve the minutes of the March 23, 2009 minutes as written, seconded by Mr. Brewington. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

SWEARING IN OF STAFF

Rawls Howard and Chris Marland were sworn in for their testimony related to matters listed on the agenda.

Chair Cross stated that he had a conflict of interest in the first two matters as one of his partners is the attorney representing this cases. For the record, Mr. Brewington stated that his wife is also in the same law firm but he does not feel that it causes a conflict of interest for him.

Mr. Pearce moved to recuse Chair Cross from BOA-09-05 and BOA-09-07, seconded by Mr. Brewington. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

OLD BUSINESS:

APPEAL FROM HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Vice Chair Pinto stated that the Board of Adjustment shall hear this appeal from the Historic Preservation Commission in the nature of certiorari. This means that the appeal is conducted entirely on the factual record established by the Historic Preservation Commission. It is on the record, as opposed to a denovo hearing. The Board of Adjustment cannot conduct a new hearing to gather additional facts. The scope of our review includes these five (5) factors: reviewing for errors of law, 2) ensuring proper procedures in both statute and ordinance have been followed;

3) ensuring that due process rights have been secured; 4) ensuring that competent material and substantial evidence supported the decision; and 5) ensuring that the decision was not arbitrary or capricious. The Board of Adjustment is authorized to overturn a decision of the Historic Preservation Commission or refer the item back to the Historic Preservation Commission only if it finds the Commission failed to comply with the legal requirements or has acted arbitrarily or capriciously. An appeal from our Board's decision shall be to Superior Court, as with variances.

- (a) **BOA-09-05: 911 MOREHEAD AVENUE John and Christine Penc appeal the decision of the Historic Preservation Commission to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness (Number 1084) in reference to replacing some exterior wood trim/soffit with vinyl material on the existing building. The first appeal was heard at the September 23, 2008 meeting and remanded back to the Historic Preservation Commission. This case was continued from the March 23, 2009 meeting. Section 30-4-4.2(E)5, Present Zoning-RM-26, BS-8, Cross Street-South Mendenhall Street. (REMANDED BACK TO HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION)**

Rawls Howard stated that there will also be a presentation by Stefan Leih Geary, Planner with the Housing and Community Development Department who is also the staff liaison to the Historic Preservation Commission.

Rawls Howard stated that the applicant is appealing a decision of the Historic Preservation Commission to deny a Certificate of Appropriateness in reference to replacing exterior wood trim/soffit with vinyl textured material on an existing building. This case was continued from the March 23, BOA 2009 meeting. This appeal was heard and remanded back to the Historic Preservation Commission at the September 22, 2008 BOA meeting. The applicant was heard at the January 28, 2009 Historic Preservation Commission meeting and a decision to deny the Certificate of Application was again put into record. The applicant is appealing this second decision of the Historic Preservation Commission concerning exterior materials that have been changed on the existing building. Tax records indicate the building was built in 1963 and the use is a duplex/triplex. The pictures of the building indicate the building is a multifamily dwelling unit. Each BOA member has a copy of the verbatim minutes from the January 28, 2009 Historic Preservation Commission's meeting concerning the application for 911 Morehead Avenue. The RM-26 Residential Multifamily Zoning District is primarily intended to accommodate multifamily uses at a density of 26.0 units per acre or less. Mr. Howard stated that there are several pertinent documents related directly to this case, that were included in each Board member's packet.

Stefan Leih Geary, Housing and Community Development, was sworn in and gave a background overview of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and detailed the process they follow for each application or violation.

Darrell Fruth, attorney representing the applicant, came forward and stated that he felt that Ms. Geary's testimony was going a little beyond a staff report and seems to be advocacy for the appeal. He also objected to any of the photographs that were not before the HPC.

Ms. Geary stated that the photographs were presented at both prior meetings. She pointed out that it is very important to note that this is an after-the-fact application and continued her presentation concerning how the meeting(s) were carried out in this particular matter.

Vice Chair Pinto asked if there was anyone wishing to speak concerning this matter.

Darrell Fruth, 230 N. Elm Street, was sworn in and stated that this matter has previously been before the Board and the matter was previously referred back to HPC. He pointed out that the property is a 1970s style brick home that is located at 911 Morehead Avenue. It is important to know that the owners currently live out of state. They had some work done on the property and that work consisted of installing a very narrow strip below the roof. They selected the material used to coincide with the existing materials. He presented materials for the Board members' review and stated that part of these materials were previously presented at the HPC meeting and are part of the record. The last tab in the booklet is a verbatim transcript of the hearing. He explained the materials in detail. He pointed out that the subject property is not an historic property but is only located at the edge of the historic district. He feels that this particular property should not have to follow the guidelines that are appropriate for actually historic properties. He also pointed to photographs to other property in the immediate area that are also not in compliance with the guidelines, i.e. use of neon signs, outside coolers and the like. HPC has allowed that particular non-complying property to continue without any repercussions. He feels that this is a completely unreasonable position for the HPC to take. He pointed out that the most significant argument comes from the verbatim minutes, wherein, staff is quoted as saying that, "if you look at the building from the street, you probably couldn't detect that there was a change." He pointed out that this comment comes from a professional whose job it is to go out and monitor compliance. He further referred to several other quotes from the verbatim transcript of the minutes. He also pointed out that the main argument seems to be that vinyl material was used on the installation and that vinyl is not an appropriate material for use in the historic district. He stated that there is documentation in the verbatim transcript addressing that vinyl windows were installed on another property previously and feels that this is where the arbitrary and capricious factors come into play for this particular case. He pointed out that there does not seem to be any change in the look of this particular property and so it seems that the same rationale should apply. He also pointed out that there was a photograph introduced that had been taken by one of the Commission members and submitted for the other Commissioners to review. He felt that this was not an appropriate action by one of the Commission members and should not have been considered in any way.

He felt that there were certainly errors of law in this case, as the Commission completely misconstrued the guidelines. He pointed out that the guidelines do not prohibit vinyl, it is just a recommendation. He pointed out that some guidelines are mandatory and some are not, i.e. some say, "must" and others say, "not appropriate" or "not recommended". He feels that the Commission went beyond their authority as the State law says that actions are limited to prevent changes that would be incongruous with the special character of the landmark or district. The Greensboro Development Ordinance limits safeguards to those that are reasonable and appropriate. The Design Manual also says that the goal for non-contributing structures is simply to do no harm to the special character of the building in the district. He feel that their actions are not reasonable and appropriate in this particular case as this is a non-consequential, non-noticeable change to a non-contributing property.

Vice Chair Pinto asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to this matter.

David Wharton, 667 Percy Street, was sworn in and stated that he is the Vice-Chair of the HPC. He read several passages from the Guidelines for the Board members to consider and answered questions posed by the Board members.

Stefan Leih Geary returned to the podium and stated that usually the Commission agrees with the staff recommendation but they usually base their decisions on their own visual inspection of the property as well as testimony from other individuals.

Speakers in favor and in opposition returned to the podium and gave rebuttal testimony.

Mr. Parmele stated that he felt the HPC was arbitrary and capricious in their decision to the degree that the minor changes do not threaten the neighborhood and the evidence does not support their decision.

Mr. Brewington stated that if someone is living in an historic district and under the guidelines, then it is difficult to live up to those guidelines. He sympathizes with the homeowners but the Board needs to go back to the points and determine whether the guidelines were interpreted properly.

Mr. Turner stated that he felt there was a lack of flexibility on the part of the HPC. This community is in a transition and is on a fringe area. He also pointed out that the building materials are only a recommendation and not a rule and the building was constructed many years before the Historic district was designated.

Mr. Strickland stated that he felt the HPC had not addressed the case appropriately as there was evidence that vinyl was not a prohibited material, it was just not a recommended material for use in the historic district.

Mr. Pearce stated he felt the decision by the HPC was arbitrary and capricious and it should be remanded back to them.

Vice Chair Pinto stated that he felt that he agreed with Mr. Brewington and the Board should affirm the decision made by the HPC. He felt they spoke to the issues they were directed to speak to at the last meeting.

After much discussion between the Board members, Mr. Pearce moved that in the matter of BOA-09-05, 911 Morehead Avenue, that the findings of the Historic Preservation Commission be overturned and remanded back to them for further action on their part so they can reconsider this matter, keeping in mind that the guidelines require flexibility and do not include a requirement that the only time vinyl is appropriate is when there is no other suitable building material. It was found that the Historic Preservation Commission acted arbitrarily and capriciously by instituting a standard that if there were other suitable materials, vinyl would not be appropriate, seconded by Mr. Strickland.

Vice Chair Pinto stated it may be helpful for the Board of Adjustment to give some guidance on what the Board expects the HPC to do at this time.

It was suggested that more consideration should be given to the non-contributing structure and more flexibility should be given to non-conforming structures and these are the factors that were considered by the Board members in coming up with their decision. The Board also recognizes that there is not a black and white rule that can be addressed in this particular case, therefore, flexibility is recommended.

The Board voted 4-2-1 and the matter was remanded back to the Historic Preservation Commission. (Ayes: Pearce, Parmele, Turner and Strickland. Nays: Pinto and Brewington. Abstained: Cross.)

Chair Cross was also recused from the following matter.

NEW BUSINESS

VARIANCE

- (a) **BOA-09-07: 303 MAYFLOWER DRIVE Stephen Tanis and Richard Garrapula request a variance from a minimum rear setback requirement. *Violation: A proposed attached addition/garage will encroach 15 feet into a 20-foot rear setback. Table 30-4-6-1, Present Zoning RS-7, BS 23, Cross Street-Wright Avenue. (GRANTED)***

Rawls Howard stated that the applicant is proposing to construct an attached addition/garage to the existing single family dwelling. The addition will encroach 15 feet into a 20-foot minimum rear setback. The property is located on the eastern side of Mayflower Drive north of Wright Avenue and South Aycock Street on zoning map block sheet 23. Tax records indicate the house was built in 1937. The property is currently zoned RS-7 (Residential Single Family, 7,000 square feet per lot). The adjacent properties are also zoned RS-7. The applicant is proposing to construct what appears to be an addition and a garage attached to the dwelling. Attached structures must meet the same setbacks as the principal building. The applicant has made mention of an existing detached building which is located approximately 2 feet from the rear lot line. Detached buildings have lesser setback requirements than principal buildings.

The original lot was approximately 72 feet by 150 feet containing 10,800 square feet. A Section of the property at the rear consisting of 22 feet x 25 feet (550 square feet) was sold to the owners of Lot #19. The tie-bar on the tax map indicates that the rear portion of the applicant's lot (#17) and lot (#19) to the north are combined with a 10 foot alley located between them. When this occurred, it created an irregular rear lot line for this lot. The tax map also shows an alley between these two lots that continues out to South College Park Drive. The alley appears to have 5 feet on each of these lots for a total alley width of 10 feet. A copy of the tax map is attached. The RS-7, Residential Single-Family District is primarily intended to accommodate high density single-family detached dwellings in developments where public water and sewer services are required. The overall gross density on RS-7 will typically be 5.0 units per acre or less.

Vice Chair Pinto asked if there was anyone wishing to speak concerning this matter.

Derek Allen, attorney representing the applicant, 230 N. Elm Street, was sworn in and presented materials for the Board members' review. He stated that as part of his information is a copy of a petition that has been signed by all the surrounding neighbors, stating that they have no opposition to the request. The original was presented to the Board's counsel. He pointed out that there is overwhelming support for the proposed project because the applicant is making an unattractive situation into something that is much better in terms of the way it works in the parking area and the way it looks. He explained the plans for this project in detail. He pointed out that all the tests have been met for granting a variance on this particular property.

Tom Kirbysmith, 305 Mayflower Drive, was sworn in and stated that his home is directly adjacent to the property discussed and he completely supports the request. The property is shaped in a peculiar manner and he feels the applicant would be unable to make construction without the variance.

There was no one speaking in opposition to this request.

Mr. Brewington moved that in the matter of BOA-09-07, 303 Mayflower Drive, the findings of the Zoning Coordinator be incorporated into the record by reference, and that the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variance granted as there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships that result from carrying out the strict letter of the ordinance. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance, he can make no reasonable use of this property as there are unique circumstances involving the owner's garage from land that was purchased and sold previously, creating a very unique problem for them and the hardship of which the applicant complains results from the unique circumstances related to the applicant's property. The hardship results from the application of this ordinance to this property because it centers around the unique shape of the property and the fact that this is something that occurred in an older neighborhood at some point in the past. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance and preserves its spirit because it creates a more aesthetically appealing situation and shows support from the neighborhood and it appears it will be more appealing. The granting of the variance assures the public safety and welfare and does substantial justice because evidence has been shown supporting the granting of the variance, seconded by Mr. Turner. The Board voted 6-0-1 and the variance was granted. (Ayes: Pinto, Pearce, Brewington, Turner, Strickland and Parmele. Nays: None. Abstained: Cross.)

At this time a five minute break was taken from 4:25 until 4:31 p.m..

- (b) BOA-09-08: 1704 WILLOW WICK DRIVE James and Martha Barry request a variance for a detached accessory dwelling unit that will encroach into a rear setback. Violation: A proposed detached accessory dwelling unit will encroach 20 feet into a 30-foot rear setback. Table 30-4-6-1 and Section 30-5-2.3.2 (7), Present Zoning-RS-12, BS-52, Cross Street-Asbury Terrace. (DENIED)**

Rawls Howard stated that the applicant requests a variance for a proposed detached carport with accessory dwelling unit that will encroach 20 feet into a 30-foot rear setback. The lot is located on the north side of Willow Wick Drive west of Asbury Terrace on zoning map block sheet 52. The average lot width is 125 feet and the average lot depth is 213 feet. The total lot area is approximately 26,000 square feet. The property is currently zoned RS-12 (Residential Single Family, 12,000 square feet per lot). The adjacent properties are also zoned RS-12. The lot contains an existing single family dwelling. Detached dwelling units are required to meet the same setbacks as principal dwelling units and must be 10 feet from the principal dwelling unit.

Based on the scale drawing, the total footprint is proposed to be approximately 1,400 square feet on the ground, (uncertain if any area of the structure is proposed to be two-story). It appears that the carport portion is proposed to be 22 feet by 22 feet (484 square feet), which will make the dwelling less than 1,000 square feet, (if it is a one-story detached dwelling). Based on the existing dwelling containing 3,600 heated square feet, the detached dwelling unit, if permitted, is allowed to contain 1,000 square feet of area. The rear portion of the lot contains a 10-foot utility easement.

The structure is not proposed to be in the easement. The RS-12, Residential Single-Family District is primarily intended to accommodate moderate density single-family detached dwellings in developments where public water and sewer services are required. The overall gross density in RS-12 will typically be 3.0 units per acre or less.

Chair Cross asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

James Barry, the applicant, was sworn in and stated that he hopes to obtain a variance for the carport and the proposed dwelling for use by his father-in-law for his remaining years. The architect and builder have worked on plans to make a solution that is additive to the existing home as well as the neighborhood.

Steven Jobe, the architect, 3314 Watauga Drive, was sworn in and presented drawings and a site plan of the proposed construction. He explained the plans for the development of the property in detail. He pointed out that there is a vacant lot next to the applicant's property. He indicated the location of the existing driveway and the existing parking area and the proposed location of the proposed construction. He further stated that it is felt that the unique circumstances are related to the current location of the existing driveway and the slope of the property. Because of the location of the existing house, there are a limited number of places the proposed structure could be placed and still be functional. He pointed out that the hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions as these are existing conditions on the property.

In response to a question by Mr. Howard concerning the square footage of the proposed structure, Mr. Jobe stated that the dwelling portion of the building will be 668 square feet.

In response to questions, Todd Wolfus, with Gary Jobe Builders, 421 N. Edgeworth Street, was sworn in and pointed to the drawing showing the existing slab in an area that is probably 25' x 40'.

Mr. Barry returned to the podium and pointed out that because of the slope of the land on his property, the proposed construction would, in effect, help with the drainage from his property to his neighbors to the south and would be a betterment to all the neighbors down the line.

Chair Cross stated that Mr. Howard received a letter from a neighbor who had concerns about protecting the value, use and enjoyment of their property if the variance is allowed. They felt that the structure so close to the proposed property line will have a negative impact on the use and enjoyment of their property. They are also concerned that the structure will be used as rental property at some time in the future by subsequent owners and they are opposed to the granting of a variance for this property.

Mr. Barry stated that he also had a letter from another neighbor who is in support of the request. He then answered further questions posed by the Board members.

After some discussion Mr. Strickland moved that in regard to BOA-09-08, 1704 Willow Wick Drive, the findings of staff be incorporated by reference and that the Zoning Enforcement Officer be upheld and the variance denied, as because of the setbacks this will encroach into the setbacks, that there is reasonable use regardless of whether the structure is built or not, the hardship is the result of the proposed application, seconded by Mr. Pinto. The Board voted 7-0 and the variance was denied. (Ayes: Cross, Pinto, Pearce, Brewington, Turner, Strickland and Parmele. Nays: None.)

- (c) **BOA-09-09: 2, 8, 10, 12, 14, & 16 SILENT SPRING COURT Wolfe Construction Inc., request variances from the minimum front street setback requirement. *Violation:* Each of the lots will provide 20 feet front setbacks instead of the required 25 feet; thus a variance of 5 feet for each of the six lots is requested. Table 30-4-6-1 and 30-4-6-2, Present Zoning-CD-RS-12 (CL), BS-168, Cross Street-Clarkson Road. (GRANTED)**

Rawls Howard stated that the applicant requests a variance to change the minimum front setback on six lots from 25 feet to 20 feet. The property is located west of Fleming Road and north of Country Woods Lane. The property is currently zoned RS-12(CL) (Residential Single Family, with Cluster Zoning Development option). The Preliminary Plat containing 81 lots was approved by TRC on April 24, 2007. The property was eligible to develop using cluster zoning requirements. The lot size and setbacks were reduced to the RS-7 zoning district requirements. The objective of cluster development is to place houses closer together on smaller lots than normally permitted in the zoning district and to place land which would otherwise have been included in private lots into public dedication or common elements for open space.

The applicant has several lots that are located on the northern side of Silent Spring Court. The rear portions of these lots contain gas line, fiber optic and noise cone overlay easements. The property is exempt from the noise cone requirements under the Airport Overlay District. Based on the easement areas, the applicant is requesting to change the building envelopes to allow a five foot encroachment into the front setback for lots 36, 37, 38, 39 40 and 43. The RS-12(CL), Residential Single-Family District is primarily intended to accommodate moderate density single-family detached dwellings in developments where public water and sewer services are required. The overall gross density in RS-12(CL) will typically be 3.0 units per acre or less. The lot size and building setbacks are permitted to use the RS-7 requirements.

Chair Cross asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

David Stack, representing Wolfe Construction and the applicant, was sworn in and stated that they wish to go from a 25' setback from the property line, which is about 10 off the street, to a 20' due to a retaining wall on the back side of the property. The property backs up to the Colonial and Plantation pipelines which would not allow any disturbance on their side of the easement requiring a specially engineered retaining wall that is self-supporting and cannot encroach in any way into their property which shortened the depth of these lots.

There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Mr. Pinto moved that in regard to BOA-09-09, 2, 8, 1, 12, 14 & 16 Silent Spring Court, he moved to incorporate the findings as submitted by staff by reference and that the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variance granted as there are practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships that result from carrying out the strict letter of the ordinance. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance he can make no reasonable use of the property, specifically as a result of the unique configuration of the property and the easements running on the rear of the property and the slope of the property, both of which make it unfeasible to but a structure close to the rear of the property. The hardship of which the applicant complains results from the unique circumstances relating to the property as previously pointed out. Since the front easement is being changed for all of these lots, there will be uniformity in how the houses are built. The hardship results from the application of this ordinance to the property as previously stated and the

hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions but rather the result of certain easements already in place at the rear of the property and the topography of the property. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the ordinance as there is an intent to allow appropriate easement off the front while still trying to have useful and safe rear yards for the residents of these houses that are to be built and sold. Granting of the variance assures public safety and welfare and does substantial justice because there has been no testimony that there are any negative safety issues from the granting of the easements and there was some evidence that there is possibly a safety hazard to the rear of the property and this will possibly make the rear of the property more safe, seconded by Mr. Pinto. The Board voted 7-0 and the variance was granted. (Ayes: Cross, Pinto, Pearce, Brewington, Turner, Strickland and Parmele. Nays: None.)

SPECIAL EXCEPTION

Chair Cross stated that he also had a conflict with this case and would recuse himself.

Mr. Brewington moved to recuse Chair Cross from this matter and the rest of the meeting, seconded by Mr. Pearce. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Mr. Brewington stated that as in the previous case, he wished to disclose that his wife was a partner in the same law firm as Chair Cross, but he does not feel that he has a conflict of interest and will participate in this matter.

- (a) **BOA-09-10: 814 RANKIN PLACE Greensboro College requests a Special Exception as authorized by Section 30-4-4.2(B)(2) to allow a residential dwelling to encroach 15 feet into a 20-foot side setback. Table 30-4-6-5, Present Zoning-CD-LO, BS-8, Cross Street-South Tate Street. (GRANTED)**

Rawls Howard stated that the applicant requests a Special Exception for a building to encroach 15 feet into a 20-foot side setback. The property is located on the north side of Rankin Place east of South Tate street on zoning map block sheet 8. It is located in the College Hill Historic District. The property is currently zoned CD-LO (Conditional District – Limited Office). The lot is currently used as a parking lot for Greensboro College. The applicant is proposing to locate a historical building (The Zenke House) onto the property. This property recently received rezoning and council approval from RS-5 to CD-LO. The applicant is requesting to locate the building 5 feet from the side lot line instead of the required 20 feet.

At their February 25, 2009 meeting, the Historic Preservation Commission recommended in favor of the applicant's request for a Special Exception to the zoning setback requirement. The LO, Limited office District is primarily intended to accommodate low intensity medical, professional, administrative, and government office uses on small to mid-sized sites near residential areas.

Vice Chair Pinto asked if there was anyone wishing to speak on this matter.

Derek Allen, attorney representing the applicant, was previously sworn in and stated that he represents Greensboro College. He stated that Mr. Howard had presented the background facts relative to the case. He explained that several organizations have been working on this project along with the College Hill Neighborhood Association and Greensboro College to relocate the

Zenke house to the rear of the old YMCA property at the corner of Rankin Place and Tate Street. The applicant is asking that the side setback be the same 5 feet that it is for all the other houses along Rankin Place. For a Special Exception the Board must find that it is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit and that the Special Exception assures the public safety and welfare. It is felt that both these criteria are met with this request.

There was no one speaking in opposition to the request.

Mr. Brewington moved that in regard to BOA-09-10, 814 Rankin Place, the facts as submitted by staff be incorporated into the record by reference and the Special Exception be granted as that it is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit because it is returning a home to the neighborhood and turning a parking lot into a useable residential space and that the Special Exception assures the public safety and welfare as it is restoring the neighborhood back to a residential feel, seconded by Mr. Pearce. The Board voted 7-0 and the Special Exception was granted. (Ayes: Pinto, Pearce, Brewington, Turner, Strickland and Parmele. Nays: None. Abstained: Cross.)

ABSENCES:

The absence of Ryan Shell was acknowledged.

OTHER BUSINESS

TIME LIMITATIONS FOR REHEARING REQUESTS

It was determined by consensus that this matter would be addressed during the May meeting.

ADJOURN:

* * * * *

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Cross, Chair
Greensboro Board of Adjustment

JC/jd